

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
COLUMBIA DIVISION

|                           |   |                        |
|---------------------------|---|------------------------|
| United States of America, | ) | Cr. No. 3:08-590 (CMC) |
|                           | ) |                        |
| v.                        | ) |                        |
|                           | ) | <b>ORDER</b>           |
| Vicente Sepulveda, Jr.,   | ) |                        |
|                           | ) |                        |
| Defendant.                | ) |                        |
| _____                     | ) |                        |

This matter is before the court on Defendant’s motion requesting termination of supervised release. ECF No. 1853. The United States Probation Office is opposed to early termination.

Title 18 United States Code Section 3583(e) provides that

The court may, after considering the factors set forth in section 3553(a)(1), (a)(2)(B), (a)(2)(C), (a)(2)(D), (a)(4), (a)(5), (a)(6), and (a)(7)—

- (1) terminate a term of supervised release and discharge the defendant released at any time after the expiration of one year of supervised release, pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure relating to the modification of probation, if it is satisfied that such action is warranted by the conduct of the defendant released and the interest of justice . . . .

Considerations contained in § 3553 include, *inter alia*, the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant; the ability to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct; the need to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant; and the need to provide the defendant with needed educational or vocational training, medical care, or other correctional treatment in the most effective manner. 18 U.S.C. § 3553.

“The plain language of the statute illustrates that § 3583(e), in the typical case, allows a conduct-based inquiry into the continued necessity for supervision after the individual has served

one full year on supervised release.” *United States v. Pregent*, 190 F.3d 279, 282-83 (4th Cir. 1999). However, the statute

is not exclusively limited to considerations of conduct. The language of the statute notes that the district court ‘may’ terminate supervised release ‘if it is satisfied that such action is warranted by the conduct of the defendant released and the interest of justice.’ The phrase ‘the interest of justice’ does give the district court latitude to consider a broad range of factors in addition to an individual’s behavior in considering whether to terminate the supervised release period.

*Id.* at 283 (citation omitted).

Defendant has completed approximately 18 months of his three-year period of supervised release. Probation notified the court it does not support early termination because Defendant’s mother, a co-defendant in the case, remains a fugitive. Probation also noted Defendant is not on low-risk supervision, as he alleged in his motion. For these reasons, Defendant’s motion is denied.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Cameron McGowan Currie  
CAMERON MCGOWAN CURRIE  
Senior United States District Judge

Columbia, South Carolina  
June 11, 2019